

220.6

Ol5s

Olmstead, A. T. E.

Source study and the
Biblical text. [1913?]

Return this book on or before the
Latest Date stamped below. A
charge is made on all overdue
books.

U. of I. Library

NOV 25 1942

NOV 25 1942

M32

Gaylord Bros.
Makers
Syracuse, N. Y.
PAT. JAN. 21, 1908

SOURCE STUDY AND THE BIBLICAL TEXT

A. T. OLMSTEAD

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS LIBRARY

MAY 1 1917

Reprinted for private circulation from THE AMERICAN JOURNAL
OF SEMITIC LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES, Vol. XXX, No. 1, October 1913



220.6
025s

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL
OF
SEMITIC LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES
(CONTINUING HEBRAICA)

VOLUME XXX

OCTOBER 1913

NUMBER 1

SOURCE STUDY AND THE BIBLICAL TEXT

BY A. T. OLMSTEAD
University of Missouri

The historian cannot use his facts until he has proved his sources. To do this, he uses source criticism, or, as it has been most unfortunately called in its application to the biblical writings, the "Higher Criticism." In most fields of history, it is rarely necessary to go behind the printed sources, and, when we must do so, the philological criticism demanded is of the simplest. But, as need hardly be pointed out, the situation as regards the early Hebrew writings is very different. Our Hebrew manuscripts are, without exception, very late, though it is true that their text can be traced back some centuries earlier. When, however, we come to compare this text with that furnished by the various versions, and particularly with those made into or from the Greek, we soon discover that the texts they used differed widely, that with the aid of these various translations or revisions we are able to trace the growth of the text, and that the various stages show us, almost without exception, progressive additions to an original text. Here and there we do find additions which had been made to the original from which the Septuagint was translated, after it had parted company with the original of the present Hebrew text, but these additions are rarely of importance, and, after we have cut them out, we have, not indeed the original, but at least a text which represents the earliest form which can be

secured by manuscript study. Accordingly, before we can begin our study of the sources, we must first have before us the text on which was based the Septuagint.

All this is accepted by modern scholars, at least in theory, but the practice can hardly be said to be in agreement. The usual method followed for securing such a base text has been that of taking the present Massoretic text and then correcting it by means of the versions in such places as the individual scholar has thought such action necessary. The scholars who have done the authoritative work on problems of the lower criticism have rarely been interested in those of the higher, and students of the higher criticism, on the other hand, have but rarely attempted to work out the broader problems of the versions, usually contenting themselves with the textual criticism of individual passages. An attempt to apply some of the results secured by the study of the versions to questions of historical criticism seems worth making.

When, however, we begin such an attempt, we face at once the greatest of the problems connected with the versions, the question as to what really is the Septuagint. We can no longer accept the readings of the oldest manuscript or even group of manuscripts, for we find them differing in their relationships in different books. Oftentimes it is a group of cursives, derived from an old archetype, which has preserved facts of the greatest value. While the problems are all more or less interrelated, yet those of each book must be studied by themselves. Within the last few years, a little band of scholars has produced some splendid work on the history of the text and on the problems presented by the various recensions.¹ Certain facts have been clearly proved, and, what is of even more importance, we have learned something of method. Perhaps the time is premature to attempt to apply such results to the problems of the historical criti-

¹ For general discussion of work done, see G. F. Moore, in this Journal, XXIX, 37 ff. Howorth, in the *Proc. Soc. Bibl. Arch.* is always suggestive and deserves to be better known. Torrey's *Ezra Studies* are too well accepted for praise to be needed. Margolis' articles in *Jour. Amer. Orient. Soc.* and in this Journal are a mine of information, and so is Proksch's *Septuaginta Studien*. Silberstein, *Zft. f. d. alttest. Wiss.*, XIII, 1 ff., deals with the A and B texts, but disavows an attempt to do this sort of work, and Rahlfs' fine *Septuaginta Studien* only deal with the Lucianic data. Thackeray's work in the *Jour. Theol. Stud.* was seen only when the article was practically complete, and the many coincidences and dovetailings, some of which are here given, add much to our certainty as to the results.

cism, but at least it is better to use these partial results than to work out theories as to the sources with no reference to them at all.¹

The old idea that the so-called Septuagint represents a homogeneous whole has long since been abandoned. In the absence of a more accurate nomenclature, it may, however, be permitted to apply this term to the earliest translation we possess of any particular book, only premising that it is not any of those which were used in Origen's *Hexapla* as the late date of these is well known. The question as to the date of translation of any individual book is a very difficult one to answer, but an answer, at least an approximate one, is necessary if we are to understand the stage in the history of the text marked by the translation. It is, for example, absolutely necessary to distinguish between types of text marked at one extreme by the very early translation of the Law, say 250 B.C., and on the other by the common translation of Daniel which has always been known to be that of Theodotion and which must therefore date nearly four centuries later. Obviously, the one witnesses to a text much earlier in date than that of the Massorettes, while the latter is essentially identical with it, at least in those passages where the Semitic original has been preserved. In the case of Daniel, we are fortunate enough to have a manuscript which gives us the original Septuagint, and we have also the testimony of the Syro-Hexaplar. From the hexaplaric data, we can see that this does not perfectly represent its original. Daniel itself is so late and its tone is so in keeping with that of the time when the additions were made that we should think there was probably little temptation to expand it to fit its utterances to the later point of view. Yet comparison with the text of Theodotion shows a good plenty of expansions and changes.

That even a book of such late date would not be preserved untouched through this period of editing is shown in an even more striking manner by the case of the Chronicler's writing. One could ask for no man more in sympathy with the later viewpoint than he, yet Howorth² and Torrey³ have been able to show that the current

¹ This study grew out of an investigation of the sources for Assyrian times, a part of which is seen in the author's *Sargon* and the remainder in *Assyrian Historiography* soon to be published. Aid and encouragement must be acknowledged to Professor N. Schmidt of Cornell, under whom the writer first learned the use of Holmes and Parsons, and to Professor Torrey of Yale and Professor G. F. Moore of Harvard.

² *Proc. Soc. Bibl. Arch.*, XXIII, 158.

³ *Ezra Studies*, 62 ff.

Greek translation is not the Septuagint, and that this differs widely from the fragment of the real Septuagint preserved in what we know as I Esdras. When we compare this with the Massoretic text, or with its Greek translation, the differences are startling. Two long sections of great interest are entirely missing, a serious dislocation covering several chapters has taken place, and many more minor changes show the untrustworthy character of the Massoretic edition and of its translation, the so-called Septuagint.¹ In fact, we have to deal, not with textual corruption, but with a thorough re-editing. Now this fragment covers only Ezra with small portions of Chronicles and Nehemiah. For the remainder, including all but two chapters of the long book we call Chronicles, we have only the translation in Greek of what is essentially our present Hebrew text. This means that for these sections we have no manuscript means of going much behind the text. That the real Septuagint would have shown us changes to have taken place not only of text but of content and as serious as those proved by I Esdras, we may be sure, but to discover these changes we can only use conjecture.

This conclusion has a consequence of a serious character. Since we do not have the earlier edition of Chronicles, made before the later harmonization could have taken place, it is almost impossible to discuss without serious danger of error its relation to Kings. That such harmonization could have easily taken place is shown by the Greek translation where it parallels I Esdras, for here long additions from Kings are made. To be sure, these particular additions are no more to be found in the Hebrew than in I Esdras, but they at least show the possibility of such harmonization. Nor, despite the fact that there are so few parallels between Kings and Chronicles in the short section where we can use I Esdras as check, are we without indications of such harmonization in the text of Chronicles, for I Esdras had neither the Eliakim and the change of name of II Chron. 36:4, nor the reigning eleven years in Jerusalem of the next verse, nor the "rising up early and sending" of 36:15, the last a frequent expression in the post Septuagintal additions to Jeremiah. As these are both in Kings, there can be no doubt as to the latter being the original source. If here, where there was so little inducement, two

¹ Torrey, *Ezra Studies*, *passim*.

such harmonizations, involving not merely changes of the text but the addition of facts of real importance, could take place, we have every reason to suspect far greater harmonization in the passages where closer relationship is indicated. Other additions to the Hebrew text are proved by even the present Greek translation to have been made after its original had been translated. That more serious additions were made to it in the earlier period, and just after the time of the first Greek translation, when so many were made to other books, is extremely probable. The possibility then remains that some individual misdeed attributed to the Chronicler in reality should be laid up against a reviser. Of much more serious moment is the showing that we cannot prove identity of source with any certainty because our *present* texts of Kings and Chronicles agree.

The preceding statements in regard to the work of the Chronicler will probably be accepted by all scholars who have studied the textual problems of the book. What is not so well known is that the same conditions can be shown to exist in the case of Kings. If we anywhere have the original Septuagint preserved to us, outside of the Law, it will generally be agreed that it is in the book of Jeremiah. At any rate, it certainly is a translation dating from before our era. It is well known that this translation, like all the earlier ones, is a good bit shorter than the Hebrew, by one-eighth it is estimated. The great mass of hexaplaric material which has come down to us, thanks especially to that given us by Codex Q, makes a study of the gradual growth of the text both easy and profitable. The growth of the text as it goes through the hands of Symmachus¹ and Aquila and the sudden expansion which occurs in the translation of Theodotion, as well as the data which are given only under the asterisk, will be dealt with in a later paper. Here we are interested only in the fact that Jeremiah 39: 4-13, omitted in all the great manuscripts,² is quoted *in*

¹ It is curious that Symmachus, clearly the latest in personal date, has the shortest, i.e., earliest text. It is generally assumed, cf. Swete, *Introd.* 51, that he used all his predecessors. We may compare the case of Codex B where we have generally in the Old Testament a hexaplaric, i.e., later text, but with the plus of that text omitted.

² The passage is found only in 36, 48, 51, 96, 228, 233, 239, on the margin of 86, and under the * in 88. It is worthy of note that it is omitted in the Paris codex of the Arabic quoted in Walton's Polyglot, a MS which regularly omits the hexaplaric plus. Since it is omitted by the translator of the second part of Jeremiah, whose date must be later than the LXX of Daniel which he quotes in Baruch, Thackeray, *Jour. Theol. Stud.*, IV, 265, but was found in the original of the "Three," the date of the insertion can be fixed to a time not far from the Christian era.

extenso on the margin of Codex Q where it is attributed to Theodotion. That this section was inserted, obviously from the parallel passage in Kings, is an important bit of information, and should be used in a study of the sources of Jeremiah. But far more important for our present purpose is it that we may compare this passage of Theodotion with the Greek text of Kings. Now assuming that Theodotion had already made his translation of Kings, we should naturally expect him to use, so far as permitted by a similar Hebrew original, the same translation for Jeremiah. That this is the case is clearly enough shown by a comparison of the two texts where they have such a common Hebrew original.

Kings: Και παντες οι ανδρες του πολεμου εξηλθον νυκτος
 Jeremiah: Και παντες οι ανδρες του πολεμου . . . εξηλθον νυκτος . . .
 οδον πυλης της
 οδον . . . της πυλης

ανα μεσον των τειχεων αυτην η¹ εστιν του κηπου του βασιλεως . . . και
 ανα μεσον των τειχεων (κηπου του βασιλεως) και
 επορευθη οδον την
 εξηλθον οδον την

Αραβα και εδιωξεν² η δυναμις των Χαλδαιων οπισω του βασιλεως
 Αραβα και κατεδιωξεν δυναμις Χαλδαιων κατοπισθεν αυτων
 και κατελαβον αυτον
 και κατελαβον του

 εν αραβωθ Ιεριχω . . . και συνελαβον τον Βασιλεα και
 Σεδεκιαν εν αραβωθ Ιεριχω και ελαβον αυτον και
 ηγαγον αυτον προς βασιλεα
 ανηγαγον αυτον . . . προς βασιλεα

Βαβυλωνος εις Δεβλαθα (so A.) και ελαλησεν μετ αυτου κρισιν και τους
 Βαβυλωνος εν Ρεβλαθα . . . και ελαλησεν μετ αυτου κριματα και τους
 ιους Σεδεκιου
 ιους Σεδεκιου

εσφαξεν κατ οφθαλμους αυτου και τους οφθαλμους Σεδεκιου
 (εσφαξεν) κατ οφθαλμους αυτου . . . και τους οφθαλμους Σεδεκιου
 εξετυφλωσεν και εδησεν
 εξετυφλωσεν και εδησεν

¹ GL om.

² GL κατεδιωξεν.

αυτον εν παιδες (so A.) και ηγαγεν¹ εις Βαβυλωνα . . . και
 αυτον εν παιδες . . . του αγαγειν αυτον εις Βαβυλωνα . . . και

ενεπρησεν . . . τον
 (ενεπρησαν) . . . τον

οικον του βασιλεως και το περισσον του λαου το καταλειφθεν εν τη
 οικον του βασιλεως και το λοιπον του λαου τους υπολειφθεντας εν τη
 πολει και τους
 πολει και τους

ενπεπτωκοτας οι ενεπεσον . . . και το λοιπον . . . Ναβουζαρδαν ο
 εμπεσοντας οι ενεπεσαν . . . και το λοιπον . . . Ναβουζαρδαν ο
 αρχιμαγειρος.
 αρχιμαγειρος.

It will not require more than a glance at the parallel passages shown above² to indicate beyond doubt that these two texts are closely related; in fact, our first impression is that they are virtually identical. Where the two have a similar Hebrew text behind them, they are translated in the same fashion, the variants being only what we should expect to develop through the accidents of manuscript transmission. And this impression is strengthened when we find here what is the most characteristic feature of Theodotion, the large number of transliterations.³ In this one chapter of Kings we have *αραβα, αραβωθ, μεχωνωθ, ιαμειν, χωθαρ, σαβαχα*, and of these *μεχωνωθ* is actually cited for Theodotion in Jer. 27:19. As a rule, proper names in this part of Kings are not Hellenized. Equally characteristic of Theodotion is the closeness of the translation to the Hebrew, so close that we might almost say that it is Hebrew in Greek dress.⁴

¹ Most MSS add *αυτον*.

² In general, the Lucianic text differs considerably from the other manuscripts, especially as regards its minus, and in some cases is probably closer to the true LXX. But note also that, in several cases, it has preserved the Theodotonic readings in Kings otherwise witnessed only by the Q margin of Jeremiah.

³ Field, *Hexapla*, I, xl, f.; cf. Torrey, *Ezra Studies*, 69 ff.; Burney, *Notes on the Text of Kings*, xxviii f. They are especially numerous in the second book, Burney, *loc. cit.* On the basis of these transliterations, Torrey, *Ezra Studies*, 339, has already pointed out Theodotonic elements in Kings.

⁴ Note the Hebraisms, Burney, *Text*, xxvii. While we naturally have no complete texts of Aquila and Symmachus, we have fragments enough, identified by the Syro-Hexaplar and given us in Greek form by such codices as 22 and 36, to test by them. In not one case where they differ from Theodotion in either Jeremiah or Kings are they to be found in the "Septuagint" of Kings.

If the Jeremiah text is that of the true Septuagint,¹ then at first glance the closeness of the Kings text to that given in Jeremiah 52 would seem to argue against the attribution to Theodotion. But closer examination shows differences as striking as the likenesses. That the two translations are related must be admitted.² But the many transliterations of the Kings passage are almost without exception absent. While Kings is extremely literal, some attempt is made in Jeremiah to write good Greek. The two will use identical phraseology in a sentence, save that the verb or the noun which gives the tone to it will be different, thus indicating that one is a revision of the other. In the use of the article, Jeremiah is decidedly the superior. Kings translates literally by a nominal expression, as, for example, in 25, 27, *εν τω ενιαυτω της βασιλειας αυτου*, while Jeremiah 52, 31, makes of it a dependent clause, *εν τω ενιαυτω ω βασιλευσεν*. In general, Jeremiah has the fairly free, somewhat literary style which we are accustomed to expect in the earlier translations, while the other is painfully literal. And our study of this chapter throws a little light on another problem. The long additions of the Hebrew in this chapter are not found in the Septuagint, that is natural enough,³ but, what is more curious, they seem to be missing also in the text of the "Three" which here make very meager additions. They are attributed to the mysterious editor who is simply indicated by the asterisk in Codex Q. It is worthy of note that even Theodotion, not to speak of Symmachus and Aquila, had not the statistics of 52:27b-30 or the "doing evil in the sight of Yahweh" of verses 2-3, and so a date for this insertion after his time seems fixed. However that may be, the "Septuagint" of Jer., chap. 52, is closely akin to but not the same as the text used by Kings.

Thus far we have been able to prove that the text of our Greek

¹ According to Thackeray, *Jour. Theol. Stud.*, IV, 260, this chapter was made by a third translator. He also notes that it is not in Codex 41. Is Jer., chap. 52, a fragment of the true Septuagint of II Kings?

² Thackeray, *loc. cit.*, says that the Greek Jer., chap. 52, is not taken from the Greek of II Kings, chap. 24-25. If by this he means that they are not related, he is certainly mistaken.

³ The Old Latin MS Corb. n. 2, Sabatier, II. 2. 720 ad v. 12, supports the Greek omissions, also the "three score men," etc., of 25, the topographical data of 26, the month and day of 31, while for 32 f. we have the much better reading "He changed his garments and placed his throne above all the Jews who were in Babylonia." The Arabic Paris MS omits 2-3; the date in 12; nearly all 15 f.; the proper names of 24; and 28-30; and shortens 27.

Kings is at least closely related to that ascribed to Theodotion and that the probabilities are in favor of admitting their identity. This is made a practical certainty by another parallel passage, II Kings 18:13-20: 7, duplicated in Isa., chaps. 36-39. Here too we have a prophetic work whose translation is recognized as that of the Septuagint,¹ and here too we should expect Theodotion to have used his Kings translation in that of Isaiah. Comparison of the two texts shows exactly the same relationship as we have found to exist between the text of Kings and that of Jer., chap. 52, the Kings again being the more literal. One interesting illustration of the tendency of Kings to transliterate while the Septuagint translated is shown by the respective use of Ararat and Armenia for the Hebrew Ararat. In addition, we note that the Isaiah text is somewhat shorter than either the Greek Kings or the Hebrew Isaiah. Since it is obvious that these additions must have been taken from the parallel accounts of Kings, we should find these attributed to Theodotion in the marginal notes of Codex Q if Kings really is his work. There is one case, Isa. 36:6, where a reading, *και τηρησει αυτην*, is attributed only to Theodotion, and that is found exactly repeated in II Kings 18:21. In 39:7, only Theodotion has *οιτινες εξελουσονται εκ σου*, and this is also repeated in II Kings 20:18, save that here we have the slight scribal variant of *οι* for *οιτινες*. *Και εις την πολιν ουκ εισελουσεται* is in Theodotion and elsewhere only in Codex B. As it is missing in *SAOQ*, evidently this is one of the cases where Codex B has suffered correction from Theodotion. Of course it is in II Kings 19:33. An instructive case is Isa. 38:6. Here Codex B has *ρυσομαι σε* which the margin of Q gives as the reading of the LXX and Aquila. Symmachus has *ελελουμαι σε*. Theodotion alone is not mentioned. Codices SAQ on Isaiah give *σωσω σε* which, by a process of elimination, we should naturally assign to Theodotion. When we turn to II Kings 20:6 we again find *σωσω σε*.² This strengthens our suspicion that this was the reading of Theodotion. More interesting still is the fact that the scribe of Q considered that the real LXX had a reading different from that of Kings, though his

¹ For the early date of Isaiah, cf. Thackeray, *Jour. Theol. Stud.*, IV, 583; X, 300 ff.; for the double division of the translation, cf. G. B. Gray, *ibid.*, XII, 286 ff.

² The Lucianic codices have *ρυσω σε* or *ρυσομαι σε* in Kings, either contamination from Isaiah or possibly a trace of the original LXX.

own text witnessed differently. Theodotion agrees with Aquila in reading *Ασσυριων* in Isa. 37:8, found also in II Kings 19:8, and with Symmachus in the *και ανεγνω κυριου* of 37:14, and *χορτος αγρου* of 37:27, these being found in II Kings 19:14 and 19:26 respectively. Most common, however, are the cases where the "Three" agree together as against the Septuagint of Isaiah. These are *προς με* 36:7; *δη* 36:8; *κυριος ειπε . . . αυτην* 36:10; *δη* 36:11; *την . . . αυτων . . . αυτων* 36:12; *απηρεν απο Λαχεις* 37:8; *ιδου συ* 37:11; *και συ ρυσθηση* 37:11; *Εζεκιας* 37:14; *Ξενναχηρειμ* 37:21; *ω δη κυριε* 38:3. Every one of these is exactly repeated in Kings. Particularly striking is the triple occurrence of the very characteristic particle *δη*. As over against all these agreements, we have only the omission of the article in 37:2, and the *Λοβανα* of Theodotion as compared with the *Λοβνα* of Codex A, for of course the *Λομνα* of Codex B and its followers¹ is due solely to internal corruption. Such differences, by their very slightness, only strengthen the belief that this identity of text means identity of author. That the text is that of Theodotion as it stands seems clear from the fact that every reference to that translator is found in Kings, while that is not true of either of the others.²

We seem thus to have proved with almost mathematical certainty that this part of Kings at least is the work of Theodotion. But we must now face the fact that in Field's edition of the Hexapla there are a number of places where we have variants from the text of Kings attributed to Theodotion, and this seems at first sight to entirely overthrow our theory. It is true indeed that there is no small number of such references, though far fewer than those to Symmachus and especially to Aquila.³ For the greater part of II Kings there are

¹ 56, 82, 119, 242, 243, 244, 246.

² The one certain reference in Philo, *Quod deus sit immut.*, 138; cf. Ryle, *Philo and Scripture*, 289; Philo:

II Kings 17:18: *Ανθρωπος του θεου*

εισηλθες προς με αναμνησαι το αδικομα

εισηλθες προς με του αναμνησαι αδικιας

μου και το αμαρτημα μου.

μου

is very close to our Kings, but the absence from Kings of the final phrase should be noted and the possibility of MS contamination cannot be denied.

³ When Silberstein, *Zif. f. d. alttest. Wiss.*, XIII, 69, says that the additions are not, as in other books, taken from Theodotion, but from Aquila, "mit nur geringen Ausnahmen," he is putting it much too strongly, but there is a large element of truth in his statement.

rarely less than three or four and sometimes ten or eleven to the chapter. But for the last chapters of the book, the ones exactly parallel to our texts, we have few indeed. In chaps. 19, 20, and 24, there are none. There is one in 25, four in 23, two in 22, one in 21, five in 18, thirteen in all. Let us examine these more closely.

In 23:10, the Syro-Hexaplar and 243 give a common reading for Symmachus and Theodotion and this we cannot explain as yet. For 23:7 Codex 243 gives *βεθθειμ* to Theodotion and this is found in 121 and a corruption of it in 247. This fact that the same form occurs in certain MSS is enough to waken interest, but no more. In 18:4 the *Νεεσθειν* attributed to Theodotion by 243 is closer to the *Νεεσθαν* of Codex B than the reading of half the regular "Septuagint" codices. In 18:28, 31, where the Theodotion reading is common to Aquila and Quinta and in 21:4; 22:13; 22:20, where Symmachus also has it, a large number of "Septuagint" MSS, sometimes a majority and sometimes important ones, agree with him. In these cases the reading of the "Septuagint" is in doubt and we may as well take the ones which agree with the Theodotion reading as those which oppose it. The addition of *μεγαν* by Aquila and Theodotion in 25:9 is also found in the Lucianic codices, and we may suspect that it is his reading and that it is given by mistake to Theodotion. The same seems true in 18:20, where *σταθμους* for *εστηριγμενα* is also found in the Lucianic Theodoret.

We begin to see light with 23:4, where 243 gives *εις το περιβωμιον . . . διαταξει* to Symmachus and Theodotion. Now the Lucianic text and Lucifer agree in giving us *Ασηρωθ*, and when these two agree, we certainly have something earlier than we can usually secure otherwise. This transliteration, then, must have been in their common original. But we have seen that transliterations are the commonest sign of the presence of Theodotion. When we find that the present "Septuagint" texts have *αλσει* and Aquila *αλσωματι*, we cannot but think that here, as in so many other places, the transliterations of Theodotion were smoothed down by the aid of another version. That our conjecture is not baseless is found in the later part of the verse where the "Septuagint" still retains the transliteration *σαδημωθ*. But Lucifer by his *convalle* shows that he had before him, not this transliteration, but the reading *εν τη φαραγγι*

which 243 attributes to Symmachus and Theodotion! In 18:19, where the Syro-Hexaplar gives to all four *ο μεγαs*, this is not only found in all the MSS of Kings, it is also found in Isaiah, so that this is not a real variant at all.

This unreliability of our sources for the hexaplaric readings best comes out in a study of 16:17. Here the "Septuagint" is given by the Syro-Hexaplar as *μεχωνωθ* while to Theodotion is given *υποστηριγματα*. Naturally, we again suspect that the attributions have been reversed. On I Kings 7:27; II Kings 25:13, this same transliteration is given for the "Septuagint" and Aquila and Symmachus have their regular terms, but there is no Theodotion. This makes us suspect that his reading was the same as the "Septuagint." The confusion becomes still more marked in Jer. 52:17, where the Syro-Hexaplar gives "the Hebrew" *μεχωνωθ* while *υποστηριγματα* is given to Aquila. 86 and 88, on the other hand, give *μεχωνωθ* to Aquila and *βασεις*, elsewhere used by Symmachus, to the "Septuagint." But fortunately, our one best authority, Codex Q, gives us *μεχωνωθ* as the reading of Theodotion in Jer. 27:19, and this we shall follow. Here then we find the proof that this transliteration really belongs to Theodotion, as we have suspected. We have proved, by confrontation of one by the other, that our sources for hexaplaric readings are confused and in part certainly incorrect. We can explain away all the difficult attributions to Theodotion in this part of Kings and the same could be done in other parts as well. That these inferior sources for our knowledge of the later translators attribute a few readings to Theodotion cannot for a moment prevent our accepting the attribution of at least this part of Kings to that translator, backed as this attribution is by so many bits of evidence which are based ultimately on our best source, Codex Q.

We may accept, then, the attribution of this translation to Theodotion. But this does not mean that the account, as a whole, has no earlier witness. We have variants on the Jeremiah passage attributed to Symmachus and Aquila and it cannot have escaped the notice of the reader that in Isaiah the great majority of the coincidences are of the "Three" as against the true Septuagint. In other words, while the identification of this form of the text with that of Theodotion is proved by the readings which are in Theodotion and

Kings alone, there was in all essentials the same text in the archetype from which the "Three" were derived. But we can go a step farther back. The Septuagint text of Isaiah is in general the same as that in Kings, save that it is shorter and that certain somewhat important differences in the vocabulary can be noted, such as, for example, the use of *κύριος* for *θεός*, of *δυναμειων* for *σαβωθ*, or of Armenia for Ararat. In general, we see here the same characteristics as in the Septuagint of Jeremiah, and so we may assume that this early Greek text was the original from which the later translations were revised. The bearing of all this on source questions of Kings and Isaiah must be left for later discussion.¹

Since we have proved this Kings text to be that of Theodotion, and that with a mass of confirmatory proof, often extracted from at first seeming hostile witnesses, we naturally ask its relation to the text of our Greek Chronicles which Torrey² has likewise attributed to that translator. Here we have plenty of material, for, in addition to the present Hebrew texts of Kings and Chronicles and the Theodotion translation of Kings, we have also for the last two chapters of Chronicles the I Esdras which Torrey has proved to be a fragment of the actual Septuagint as well as the later Greek translation. The last chapter of Chronicles may be taken for the test. Comparison between I Esdras and the Greek of Chronicles shows not the slightest agreement in the Greek, so that there is no basis for the idea that the two translations are in any way connected. On the other hand, there can be no doubt as to a close connection between the translation of Chronicles and the Theodotion of Kings. However, this does not mean that the two are identical. Rather it indicates that there is exactly the same relation between the Greek of Chronicles and of Kings as between the Greek of Jeremiah and of Isaiah on the one hand and our Theodotonic Kings on the other. The last chapter is a particularly good place to prove this point for here we have additions to the Chronicles which were not in I Esdras or in the Hebrew text. This means that they must have been added after the original Septuagint translation, but before this second one, and their absence in the Hebrew means that they were in all probability taken directly

¹ May we conjecture that here we have a fragment of the Kings Septuagint?

² *Ezra Studies*, 66 ff.

from the Greek of Kings. We should therefore naturally assume that, if the Greek Chronicles is that of Theodotion, our Theodotonic Kings and these added passages would give substantially the same text. The actual fact is that these added passages have exactly the same characteristics as the other parts of the Greek Chronicles. We shall therefore study together all the passages in the last chapter of the Greek Chronicles which are paralleled in Kings. In general, we have the same Greek words and phrases, with the following as the most important differences:

II Kings 23:31, *ονομα τη μητρι* = II Chron. 36:2, *ονομα της μητρος*; 32, *εν οφθαλμοις* = 2, *ενωπιον*; 33, *μετεστησεν* = 2, *εδησεν*; 33, *εδωκεν ζημιαν* = 3, *επεβαλε¹ φορον*; 34, *εβασιλευσεν* = 4, *κατεστησε*; 34, *βασιλεως Ιουδα* = 4, *βασιλευα επι Ιουδα²*; 34, *επεστρεψεν* = 4, *μετεστρεψεν*; 34, *εισηνεγκεν* = 4, *εισηγαγεν αυτον*; 35, *πλην ετιμογραφησαν την γην* = 4, *τοτε ηρξατο η γη φορολογεισθαι*; 35, *επι στοματος* = 4, *επι στομα*; 35, *αηρη κατα την συντιμησιν* = 4, *εκαστος κατα δυναμιν*; 35, *εδωκεν* = 4, *απητει*; 36, *υιος* = 5, *ων*; 24:1, *ανεβη* = 5, *ηλθε*; 1, *εγενηθη δουλος* = 5, *ην δουλεων*; 1, *ηθετησεν εν αυτω* = *απεστη απ αυτου*; 2, *μονοζωνους³ Μωαβ* = 5, *ληστηρια Μωαβιτων*; 2, *δουλων* = 5, *παιδων*; 3, *επι τον θυμον* = 5, *θυμος*; 3, *εν τω Ιουδα* = 5, *επι Ιουδα*; 3, *αποστησαι⁴* = 5, *του αποστηναι*; 3, *εν αμαρτιας* = 5, *δια τας αμαρτιας*; 5 *κατα παντα οσα εποιησεν* = 5, *εν πασιν οις εποιησε*; 4, *και γε αιμα αθων* = 5, *και εν αιματι αθωω ω*; 4, *ιλασθηναι* = *εξολοθρευσαι*.

These selections,⁵ which might be added to *in extenso* from other chapters, are sufficient to show that the Greek Chronicles is not from Theodotion, however closely the two may be related, for our only other possibility is to deny the validity of all the other conclusions we have previously reached. And this is confirmed by the likeness to the papyri phraseology of the Chronicles Greek, the references to the Troglodytes and Mineans—this fact of translation instead of transliteration being characteristic of a rather early book—the use of certain words in a peculiarly Ptolemaic sense,⁶ its use of *θεος* for

¹ So GL.

² Om. B, N, 19, 55, 60, 64, 71, 108, 119, 158.

³ For this word as characteristic of Theodotion, cf. Thackeray, *Jour. Theol. Stud.*, VIII, 270 ff.

⁴ The MSS vary on both these phrases.

⁵ There are practically no essential variants in the MSS, save that the Lucianic codices have a perverse inclination to insert Chronicles forms in Kings and vice versa.

⁶ Thackeray, *Jour. Theol. Stud.*, VIII, 276 f.; cf. *Grammar of O.T.*, xx, 167, note.

Yahweh, a usage found otherwise only in early books,¹ the actual attribution of a reading to Theodotion in Chronicles in a Greek fragment recently found,² and another in Nehemiah, in Codex S,³ all agree with what we have found in declaring that Chronicles is not the work of Theodotion.

But these results are by no means worthless as regards Chronicles. We see here the same differences between it and Theodotion that we have elsewhere learned to notice. The Greek Chronicles is written in better and less literal Greek, the article is better handled and more used, Greek endings are given where Theodotion exactly transliterates. So then, the Greek Chronicles represents a type of text whose analogies to the Septuagint of Isaiah and Jeremiah are clear. Yet behind it is the still earlier translation of I Esdras. Was there a similar translation, earlier than the Septuagint, of the prophetic books? When first proposed, this seems an absurdity. Yet analogy shows it not impossible.

It would appear that we must assume a somewhat similar series of changes to have taken place in the Book of Kings. In the account of the division of the kingdom, as is well known, Codex B and its supporters⁴ have, along with a peculiar translation of our Hebrew text, itself so early that but thirteen of the hexaplaric additions are to be found there,⁵ another which differs so widely from it as to form an independent narrative. The first scholar to recognize that internal credibility clearly proved it to be the earlier and more trustworthy account of the two was the founder of our modern historical method, Leopold von Ranke.⁶ He has been followed more or less fully by Stanley⁷ and Cheyne,⁸ while Benzinger⁹ has given it as full credit as possible when the Hebrew must be taken as a base text. Winckler¹⁰

¹ Redpath, *Jour. Theol. Stud.*, VII, 608.

² P. Thomson, *Zit. f. d. alttest. Wiss.*, XXXI, 308 f.

³ Torrey, *Ezra Studies*, 108.

⁴ The passage is omitted by A, 74, 92, 120, 121, 123, 134, 144, 236, 242, 247, and the Armenian, Vulgate, and Slavonic. The remainder have it in whole or in part. Lucifer of Cagliari, who quotes almost the whole verbatim, is our best authority for the Old Latin.

⁵ Silberstein, *Zit. f. d. alttest. Wiss.*, XIII, 69.

⁶ *Weltgeschichte*, III, 2, 4 ff.

⁷ Art. "Jeroboam," Smith's *Dict. of the Bible*.

⁸ Art. "Jeroboam," *Encycl. Biblica*.

⁹ *Könige*, ad loc.

¹⁰ *Alttest. Untersuch.*, 12 ff.

declared its value in the story of the sick child, which has indeed appealed to most scholars as the most probably true part of the section. Other scholars have taken a middle ground. Skinner,¹ after a full discussion, still remains uncertain, but inclines to the belief that, when interpolations are removed, the Greek gives a good story. He rather doubtfully explains that the Greek and the Hebrew accounts came from two different documents, the one northern and the other southern, both of which survived down to Greek times.² H. P. Smith³ says that "the passage partly duplicates the Hebrew text but is in part original." Cornill⁴ thinks that it "to some extent (offers) a more original form of text against the Hebrew recension, and in any case serving to control the latter." W. R. Smith⁵ is more interested in proving that the text was still unsettled at the time the translation was made and tells us that "it is probable that neither account forms any part of the original history" and that the story of the sick child is "in an impossible place." Burney⁶ notes its "inconsistency" with the B translation of the Massoretic text to which he makes it inferior. In part, according to him, it is drawn "from our book of Kings." Sabatier⁷ epigrammatically says it is "repetita, transposita, confusa, male cohaerentia."

But the extreme point of aversion to this story is found in the Stade-Schwally edition of Kings, where we read "The Hebrew text from which G was translated had after this verse a *midrash* describing Jeroboam's life and adventures. This late addition is rather fanciful and very clumsily compiled from elements in the narratives of M. . . . It is an interesting illustration of the history of M but of no value for the interpretation of the Received Text since M was repeatedly misunderstood by the compiler of this *midrash*. The secondary, fanciful, and clumsy character of this midrashic expansion may be inferred from such misunderstandings as the transfer to Shemiah of the prophecy of Ahijah . . . or the dating back of this

¹ *Kings*, 443 ff.

² This had occurred to me at one time, but the general results as to the versions here worked out prevent it.

³ *History*, 177, n. 1.

⁴ *Introd.*, 221.

⁵ *Old Testament in the Jewish Church*², 118 f.

⁶ *Notes on the Hebrew Text of Kings*, 167 f.

⁷ *Bibl. Sacr. Lat. Vers. Ant.*, I, 2, 572, n. *.

prophecy to the time after Solomon's death. . . . This *midrash* . . . has often misled modern expositors of the Books of Kings.¹ . . . The clumsiness of the editor who canceled vs. 1-20 is eclipsed by the clumsiness of the compiler of the Jeroboam *midrash* who places the story of the illness of Jeroboam's son before the election of the king."² Much the same language is used by Kittel³ who calls the account "einer recht wirren und teilweise gedankenlosen Zusammenstellung von Notizen," speaks of its "innere Unwahrscheinlichkeit," admits that it is given in the words of the earlier tradition, but in "recht freier Weise," and insists "dass 14 1-20 als überflüssig gestrichen werden."

When scholars of such deserved reputation can take this attitude, it is clear that a somewhat detailed examination of this "midrash" is demanded if we are to free the Jeroboam narrative from this reproach. That it forms a well-balanced, consistent, and probable story can best be shown by allowing the narrator to speak in his own words. We shall accordingly first present a translation of his story.

And King Solomon slept with his fathers and was buried with his fathers in the City of David. And Rehoboam his son reigned in his stead in Jerusalem. He was sixteen years old when he began to reign and he reigned twelve⁴ years in Jerusalem. And his mother's name was Naamah the daughter of Hanun the son of Nahash the king of Ammon. And he did that which was evil in the sight of Yahweh and he walked not in the way of David his father.

Now there was a man from Mount Ephraim, a servant of Solomon, and his name was Jeroboam, and the name of his mother was Zeredah,⁵ a harlot.

And Solomon gave him charge over the labor of the house of Joseph.

And he built for Solomon Zeredah which is in Mount Ephraim, and he had thirty chariots.⁶ He built Millo with the labor of the house of Ephraim, he repaired the city of David, and he was exalted over the kingdom. Solomon therefore sought to kill him, but he was afraid and fled unto Shishak king of Egypt, and was with him until the death of Solomon.

And Jeroboam heard in Egypt that Solomon was dead, and he spake in the ears of Shishak king of Egypt, saying, "Let me depart that I may go unto

¹ *Kings*, 130.

² *Ibid.*, 135.

³ *Könige*, 106 f.; cf. *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*², II, 279.

⁴ Seven, N; seventeen GL, and, in different Greek, 56, 64, 71, 119, 244, 245; twenty, Lucifer, ed. Hartel, 42.

⁵ Sarida in 247 on 14:17; otherwise Sarira.

⁶ 44, 107 om. from here.

mine own country." And Shishak said unto him "Ask what thou wilt and I will give it unto thee." (Now Shishak had given to Jeroboam to wife Ano¹ the eldest sister of his wife Thekamina, and she was great among the king's daughters, and she bare to Jeroboam Abijah his son.) But Jeroboam said "Only send me away and I will depart." And Shishak sent him away,² and Jeroboam went forth from Egypt and came to the land of Zeredah which is in Mount Ephraim. And all the tribe of Ephraim assembled together there to Jeroboam³ and Jeroboam built there a fenced camp.⁴

And his son fell sick with an exceeding great sickness. So Jeroboam⁵ proceeded to inquire concerning the child. And he said to Ano his wife "Arise, go and ask of God concerning the child, whether he will live from his sickness."⁶ Now there was a man in Shiloh and his name was Ahijah and he was three score years of age and the word of Yahweh was with him. And Jeroboam said to his wife "Arise, take in thy hand for the man of God loaves and cakes for his children and a cluster of grapes and a cruse of honey."⁷ And his wife arose⁸ and took in her hand loaves and two cakes and a cluster of grapes and a cruse of honey for Ahijah. And the man was old and his eyes were shut from seeing. And she rose up from Zeredah and went forth. And it came to pass that when she was entering the city to Ahijah the Shilonite, that Ahijah said to his servant, "Go forth, I pray thee, to Ano the wife of Jeroboam and say to her, 'Come in and stay not, for thus saith Yahweh, "I will bring evil against thee."'" So Ano came unto the man of God and Ahijah said to her, "Why bringest thou to me loaves and a cluster of grapes and cakes and a cruse of honey? For thus saith Yahweh, 'Behold thou shalt go forth from my presence and it shall come to pass that when thou enterest the gate of Zeredah that thy maidens shall come forth unto thee and say unto thee, "The child is dead."'" For thus saith Yahweh,⁹ 'Behold I will cut off from Jeroboam every male child, and it shall come to pass that they which die of Jeroboam in the city shall the dogs eat and they which die in the field shall the birds of the heavens eat.'" And the servant mourned, saying, "Alas, my master,⁸ for there is found in him a thing good in the sight of Yahweh." And the woman went away when she had heard it. And it came to pass that when she entered Zeredah, the child died and the sound of the weeping came out unto her.

Then went Jeroboam to Shechem which is in Mount Ephraim and there he assembled together⁹ the tribes of Israel. And Rehoboam the son of Solomon went up there also.¹⁰ And the word of Yahweh came to Shemaiah the

¹ So Greek; Old Latin Anna.

² So GL.

³ So GL.

⁴ 106 om. to end.

⁵ "Go to the man of God and inquire whether our son shall die," Lucifer, 46.

⁶ "And she did as her husband had said unto her," Lucifer, *loc. cit.*; 71 om. to Ahijah.

⁷ 243, 244 om.

⁸ 71 om.

⁹ Add "all" GL.

¹⁰ "Then . . . also" om. N; "and Reh . . . also" om. 245.

Enlamite, saying, "Take to thyself a new garment which has not touched water and rend it into twelve pieces and give to Jeroboam ten pieces¹ and say to him 'Thus saith Yahweh, "Take for thyself the ten² pieces to cast about thee.'"" And Jeroboam took them. Then said Shemaiah "Thus saith Yahweh, 'Over the ten tribes of Israel shalt thou reign.'"³

And the people spake unto Rehoboam the son of Solomon, "Thy father made the yoke grievous upon us and he made grievous the food for his table. Now therefore lighten it upon us and we will serve thee." And Rehoboam said to the people, "Yet three days and I will return answer unto you." And Rehoboam said, "Bring me the elders and I will take counsel with them what answer I shall return to the people on the third day." And Rehoboam spake in their ears according to what the people had said unto him. And the elders of the people said, "Thus thou shalt speak good to the people."⁴ But Rehoboam forsook their counsel and it was not pleasing in his sight. And he sent and brought in the young men that were grown up with him and spake to them the same things, saying,⁵ "Thus and so did the people send unto me." And the young men that were grown up with him said, "Thus shalt thou speak unto the people, saying, 'My little finger is thicker than my father's loins; my father chastised you with whips, but I will chastise you with scorpions.'" And the saying was pleasing in the sight of Rehoboam. And he answered the people as the young men that were grown up with him had counseled him. And all the people spake as one man, each to his neighbor, and they all cried out, "We have no portion in David, neither an inheritance in the son of Jesse; ⁶to your tents, O Israel! For this man is [fit] neither for a ruler nor for a leader."⁷ And all the people were dispersed from Shechem and each man departed to his tent. And Rehoboam made speed to depart and he mounted his chariot and went to Jerusalem. And all the tribe of Judah and all the tribe of Benjamin followed after him.⁸

And it came to pass at the return of the year that Rehoboam assembled all the men of Judah and of Benjamin and went up to fight with Jeroboam in Shechem. And the word of Yahweh came to Shemaiah the man of God, saying,⁹ "Speak to Rehoboam the King of Judah and all the house of Judah and Benjamin and to all the remnant of the people, saying 'Thus saith Yahweh, "Ye shall not go up, neither shall ye fight against your brethren the

¹ So GL.

² So GL; twelve, GB.

³ So GL; GB "to the twelve tribes of Israel . . ." is obviously incomplete.

⁴ So GL; GB "thus the people spake unto thee."

⁵ So GL; GB by mistake places the "saying" at the end of the quotation!

⁶ GL "each."

⁷ "We have . . . leader" in Old Latin according to Ambrose, Sabatier, *ad. loc.* It translated "this man will be," etc.

⁸ So Lucifer, 44 f., makes two tribes follow him.

⁹ So GL.

children of Israel. Return every man to his house¹ for this thing is of me.'"" So they hearkened unto the word of Yahweh and returned and went their way according to the word of Yahweh.²

That this text is composite in the last analysis is of course quite obvious and it is not impossible that it has had additions later made to it. But this should not prevent us from seeing that, just as it stands, it is a whole. We shall therefore first test it as to its internal credibility and then compare it with the parallel account given by the present Hebrew text. To begin with the most obvious fact, it is clear that we do not have here to do with a purely Greek story, for every single phrase can be easily recognized as a translation of some well-known phrase of Hebrew. In fact, if we attempt to thus work out the original Hebrew text behind it, we find no great difficulty in securing it, and, when secured with the aid of Hatch and Redpath's Concordance, it will be found that this Hebrew is that used in the pre-exilic writings, and especially in the prophetic cycles incorporated in our books of Kings.³ Yet this is no painful word for word translation; the writer has attempted to make as good Greek as possible for a translation. For instance, participles are used freely, and we even have two cases of the genitive absolute.⁴ All the affinities of style and language are with the early rather than with the later translators of the "Septuagint."

From the standpoint of the story-teller, the narrative is self-consistent and the unities are well preserved. The introductory passage is clearly editorial, no doubt that of the editor who made the last revision before the time of the Septuagint. This framework is the same that we find in the other parts of Kings, though we have other and new facts given. "And he did that which was evil in the sight of Yahweh" is a characteristic expression of that editor, for that it is pre-Septuagintal is proved by its occurrence in I Esdras 1:39, 44, 47. Then comes the real story which begins, as all good stories

¹ "Tent" GL.

² The value of GL here well illustrates the value of the original text which was used by Lucian for revision, especially when its use is checked as here by the Old Latin. Of course this is a very different matter from that of the elements due to Lucian himself.

³ Such a translation into Hebrew has actually been worked out. While there are a few difficulties, most of it is mechanical putting down of the phrases given by Hatch and Redpath.

⁴ 12:24k, l.

should, with "There was a man." His father's name is not given for the later interest in genealogies which found such a name in that of his son—reading with most of the Greek manuscripts Nabat for Nadab¹—had not yet arisen. The reason for this lack of a father is at once given, his mother was a harlot. Nor is this intended as a slur on the ancestry of the hero,² rather it is told in the perfectly matter of fact way of the days when the business was still perfectly legitimate.³ Then we have credited to him all the building activity of the reign. It is easy to see how this might have been transferred from him to the mighty Solomon, it is not so easy to see how a later generation, and one not in sympathy with Jeroboam and the Northern Kingdom, could have done so. And the reason Solomon had for killing him is perfectly natural, that fear of a too powerful subordinate which has blighted the career of so many an oriental official.⁴ Jeroboam is naturally eager to return when he learns of the death of Solomon, but Shishak seeks to dissuade him, offering him anything he wishes if he will remain.⁵ This offer naturally brings to the mind of the narrator the greatest of the gifts of Shishak to Jeroboam, that of his sister-in-law,⁶ which in turn leads to the mention of the birth of their son Abijah. Jeroboam, however, insists that he must go, and so he returns to his home town where he raises the standard of revolt and is joined by his tribe.

Meanwhile, the long journey from Egypt and the unsanitary character of the camp has caused the boy Abijah to fall sick. Jeroboam himself is needed in the camp where the revolt is being prepared and so is unable to go for aid, but his wife is free to visit the well-known "man of God" at Shiloh. Since the life of a child is

¹ Practically all the manuscripts have Nabat, I Kings 15:25, 27, 31. Codex A has Nabad in 27, and Nabat on 14:20. In the latter passage, there are no less than thirteen MSS where we have βασιλευσεν [N]αδαδ. This means that the N has been dropped because of the previous ν in βασιλευσεν.

² So Kittel, *Gesch.*, II, 279.

³ The later text has made her more respectable and calls her a widow!

⁴ "Solomon's attempt to kill Jeroboam . . . comes in very awkwardly without any narrative preceding to explain the king's action," Burney, *Text*, 167.

⁵ Ranke, *Weltgesch.*, III, 2, 8, explains this as taking place after the death of Solomon, whose Egyptian wife would have sufficed to hold him in a dependent position.

⁶ Is it possible that "she was great among the king's daughters" is due to the consciousness that these two sisters were daughters of the last king of the preceding dynasty and that through them the right to the throne was given to Shishak and the solar blood to his descendants?

in question, she is particularly careful to bring cakes for his children, hoping thus to enlist the paternal sympathies of the prophet. Then comes the threshold warning, followed by the direct pronouncing of the doom. The sorrow of the servant clearly represents that of the narrator, that the mysterious doom of Yahweh should so early destroy the house of the man who gave independence to Israel. For artistic effect, the ending "When she entered Zeredah, the child died and the sound of the weeping came out unto her" can hardly be excelled.

The revolt has by this time become so dangerous that Rehoboam goes to Shechem where Jeroboam has already arrived. Shemaiah the prophet, politically opposed to Ahijah, by his symbolic act gives the ten tribes to Jeroboam. The people are still willing to retain Rehoboam as their ruler, but he obstinately refuses to lighten their burdens, and so the tribes are forced into the hands of Jeroboam. Rehoboam flees home. He collects an army to regain his kingdom, but Shemaiah, true to his political leanings, refuses to permit the armies actually to fight.

The truth in this narrative it is not our business here to decide, for here we are simply laying the foundations for a later study of the history by working out the problems of the sources to be used in such a history. All we need to emphasize here is the fact that, as a story, it is perfectly consistent, and that it as consistently represents the point of view of a member of the Northern Kingdom.¹ This should be obvious from the general tone alone, that of admiration for Jeroboam's success and sorrow for the untimely fate of his dynasty, and the more obvious from the sharp contrast of "this man is fit neither for a ruler nor for a leader" as applied to Rehoboam. The large use of Elohim, represented in the Greek by *θεος*, is a well-known indication of northern origin. Such expressions as "man of God," "alas my master," "bring evil upon," the manner of cutting off,² the servant of the man of God, the threshold warning, all point to kinship with the northern cycle of prophetic stories incorporated in our Book of Kings.

Let us now turn to the rival account as given us by our present Hebrew text. The contrast is sharp, in fact, we seem hardly to be

¹ So Skinner, *Kings*, *loc. cit.*

² This expression is certainly not "Deuteronomistic" as Driver, *Introduction*, 191.

reading the same stories. This comes out particularly well in the story of the sick child. The tone is entirely different, for instead of the naïve tale of the Greek, we have one full of moralizings in the well-known phraseology of the so-called "Deuteronomistic" reviser. Note such phrases as "my servant David," "doing evil above all that were before thee"—a nonsensical expression as applied to Jeroboam—the sin of Jeroboam, the scattering of the people beyond the river, all recognized as certainly "Deuteronomistic," and the last, at least, as certainly post-exilic. The placing of the story after the king's accession has made a disguise necessary. Tirza is taken as the capital, though, from even the present Hebrew text of I Kings 15:21, it is clear that it was not made the capital before the dynastic change under Baasha. In fact, Tirza is not to be found even in the Aquila revision of the story. The close, instead of the artistic simplicity and beauty of the Jeroboam narrative, is as prosaic as we should expect it to be coming from a man who was capable of making the other "Deuteronomistic" additions. The whole point of view, indeed, is that of a Judæan to whom Jeroboam was, not the hero who gave independence to Israel, but "the man who made Israel to sin."

We find the same conditions when we come to study the story of the rent garment. As it stands in our present Hebrew text, it has long been recognized as a slight prophetic core with many "Deuteronomistic" accretions.¹ The prophecy is attributed to Ahijah instead of Shemiah, an impossible attribution when we remember the anti-Jeroboam attitude of that prophet shown in the story of the sick child.² Nor is it well fitted to its context. Although the prophecy took place, according to the "Deuteronomistic" reviser, when "they two were alone³ in the field," or even, if we accept the addition made by the Greek translator of the Massoretic text, after Ahijah had "taken him aside from the way," yet it is because of this that Solomon sought to kill Jeroboam. One wonders what miracle was brought into play to bring this knowledge to the ears of Solomon.⁴ The Jeroboam narrative, on the other hand, is perfectly rational, from the oriental

¹ Cf. Burney, *Text*, 170.

² So Ranke, *Weltgesch.*, III, 2, 11.

³ Lucifer, 44, om. "alone."

⁴ Cf. W. R. Smith, *Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, 119.

standpoint, in indicating that Solomon sought to slay him because he was "magnified over the kingdom."

There is less difference in the accounts of the actual secession but the story given in the present Hebrew text is much longer, most of the additions being due to the repetitious character of the "Deuteronomistic" reviser. It is easy to see why the later Judæan writer suppressed the sarcastic remark "for this man is fit neither for a ruler nor for a leader." The stoning of Adoniram is omitted.¹ Very interesting is the manner in which both versions state that "the tribe of Judah followed" Rehoboam. With the Jeroboam narrative, Judah and Benjamin follow him from Shechem in his flight, the statement being made as a sober historical fact. The "Deuteronomistic" reviser makes it metaphorical, thus following his usual moralizing tendencies.

As this passage is connected with Shemaiah in the earlier accounts, it is no surprise to us to find that the one following is also connected with that prophet. This agrees closely with the later version, save for one instructive exception. The poor Chronicler has been blamed, often rightly enough, for his huge numbers. But our text of Kings, at least as it stands, is not free from that blemish. Our Massoretic text of that book, 12:21, gives us 180,000 as the number of the army. Now the fact that the Chronicler also has this 180,000 would naturally be taken as proof that he here copied Kings, and so that his work was compiled after our Massoretic text had assumed practically its present form. But the fact that we have no evidence for the real "Septuagint" of this part of Chronicles should give us pause. It is much more probable that this huge number, so like those of the Chronicler and so unlike those of Kings, was taken from Chronicles by the "Deuteronomistic" reviser, or by an even later annotator, and this would then point to the knowledge of Chronicles by one of the men who operated with the text before that text reached its final form in the Massoretic edition. This does not raise any difficulty so far as the date of Chronicles is concerned, for no scholar would reduce its date so late as to prevent this supposition. But it does raise a very serious question as to the relative relation of the *present* texts of Kings and of Chronicles. And it shows us clearly that agreement of

¹ Found only in 246.

the two proves nothing as to what was in their common source, for harmonization must always be considered a possibility. We should also note that the 180,000 is also in Josephus.¹ It is quite possible, if not probable, that he found this only in the Chronicler's account so that this can hardly be used to date the recension before or after his time. As an actual fact the Greek translation of the later story almost unanimously² gives the army but 120,000, so this may have been the original reading in Kings.

We have then, in these two documents, two versions, or rather, editions, of the same original, but differing so much that they hardly seem at first glance to be connected. One seems to give us the real Septuagint, at any rate, it has preserved to us narratives which are practically unchanged from their original form and which clearly indicate their northern origin. The other is so changed in order and in character of event, and so overloaded with pious reflections that it practically gives us an entirely new work. But these are not merely isolated editions. Rather they stand at the two extremes of a development whose stages can in part still be traced.

The first stage is that witnessed by the Old Latin, as found in Lucifer.³ The greater part of the Jeroboam story proper is still preserved. But the narrative of the rent garment, even to the "Solomon has forsaken me" and the "keeping my statutes and judgments," is given the form found in our present Massoretic edition.⁴ A development apparently peculiar to the Old Latin, or its Syrian original, is found in "and it came to pass when all Israel heard that Jeroboam was returned from Egypt that they sent and called him into the congregation and made him king in Israel,"⁵ which does not quite fit with any of the other editions.

The next stage is represented by the Greek translation of those parts of the later narrative which are represented by Codex B and its supporters. Here, as in other parts of Kings, the B text is still much shorter than our Massoretic text, there being but thirteen of

¹ *Ant.*, VIII, 222.

² With the exception only of A, 247, and the Armenian.

³ Ed. Hartel, 44.

⁴ Of course it is possible that this is due to a later scribe as we have only one manuscript of Lucifer and that of the tenth century. But the peculiarities of the Old Latin are so well preserved elsewhere that we have no reason to suspect scribal correction.

⁵ Ed. Hartel, 43.

the additions witnessed for the later translations, and some of these ascriptions seem to be erroneous.¹ The majority of the additions found in our present Hebrew are added in Codex A. They are very largely taken from Aquila² and this text may be taken as the third in the development from the original text represented by our Septuagint fragments. Such additions, not found in the B translation, and therefore dating later than this Greek translation of the more developed Hebrew text, are "and the name of his mother was Zeruah," 11:26, a clear case of taking the ethnic of the earlier narrative as a proper name; "he also lifted up his hand against the king," *ibid*; "and to keep my statutes and my ordinances,"³ 34; "and will give Israel unto thee and I will for this afflict the seed of David but not forever," 38 f., the last half of which seems to point to Maccabean attempts at political influence in the name of religion; "and it came to pass when Jeroboam the son of Nebat heard of it, for he was yet in Egypt whither he had fled from the presence of King Solomon, and Jeroboam dwelt in Egypt, and they sent and called him, that Jeroboam and all the assembly came," 12:2-3a; "and answer them," 7; "Jeroboam," 12; "when all Israel heard that," 16; "but as for the children of Israel that dwelt in the cities of Judah, Rehoboam reigned over them," 17; "all Israel," "to his chariot," 18; "the house," 21, also omitted in Chronicles. Some of these additions are naturally of little importance but those worth notice are clearly "Deuteronomistic" in tone.

A fourth stage, whether in part or in whole earlier than the one last mentioned it is impossible to decide, is that of the present form of Chronicles, for the Greek translation of this later form differs so little from the current Hebrew text, only by the omission of "when they saw" and "every man" in 10:16, that we may study the two together. When we compare Chronicles with our present form of Kings, we see that this, in its *present* state, cannot possibly have been the source of even the later edition of Chronicles, though this is

¹ Silberstein, *Ztf. f. d. alttest. Wiss.*, XIII, 69.

² Silberstein, *loc. cit.* The apparatus in Burkitt, *Fragments of Aquila*, on the other hand, brings out sharply what was obvious enough already from the citations in Field, that Aquila is the one writer who has had no influence on the text of the B group. The additions in Codex A are accordingly sharply differentiated from the text to which they are added. Cf. also Thackeray, *Jour. Theol. Stud.*, IV, 584, n. 1.

³ Already in the Old Latin as found in Lucifer.

usually assumed without question. The work of the Chronicler, even in its later form, regularly has the shorter text, and this alone speaks in favor of its relative antiquity. Our later edition of the Chronicler's work may have been, indeed, probably was, harmonized with an edition of Kings later than that back of the Septuagint translation, but if it was, at that time Kings did not have "yet," 2; "assembly" (קהל), 3; "this day," "serve them," 7; "which," 9; "this," 10; "will chastise you," 11:14; "the people," "which they had given him," 13; "to your yoke," 14; "and the rest of the people," 23; "children of Israel," 24; and the substitution of "according to the word of Yahweh" for "against Jeroboam." All these are minor additions, it is true, and their enumeration would seem rather to belong to a study of textual criticism than to that of the sources. But they do prove one point of vital importance for source study, they prove that our present Kings represents a later edition of the common text than does even the later form of the Chronicler. And that proves, beyond any doubt, that the later form of Chronicles was *not* taken, present theories to the contrary, from our present form of Kings. And that reopens the whole question as to the relative relations of Kings and Chronicles in their original forms.

A beautiful illustration of the evil effect of the feeling that our present text of Chronicles must always and ever be explained from our present text of Kings is shown in vs. 21. Here Kings has added "all," "the tribe," "house," "son of Solomon," the last an example of that later genealogical interest which has added literally hundreds of "sons of" which were not to be found in the original of the Septuagint. Yet our latest commentator on Chronicles¹ can say "The Chronicler has thus, without impairing the narrative, shortened the verse by the omission of five words." Were he not under the influence of a theory, he would hardly have made a suggestion so opposed to the general experience of students of the text, for no reason for such a curious set of omissions, which do not impair the narrative, can be found, and probability is, other things being equal, always in favor of the shorter text.

Possibly we should attribute some importance to the omission by the Chronicler of vs. 20, though this is generally explained by saying

¹ Curtis, *ad loc.*

that he made the omission because he is narrating only the history of the Southern Kingdom.¹ However, we should note that it is the only verse omitted in this account, that the Chronicler is not accustomed to omit single sentences thus imbedded in his text, and that the tone of the verse is late, for example, it uses עדה, "congregation," a priestly word. So perhaps we may take this verse as an addition made after the later Greek translation. On the other hand, its omission in even this translation of Kings shows that vs. 17 is a late harmonization of Kings to Chronicles, another argument against the prevailing view as to the relation of the two works. If we could only be sure of his use of proper names, we might argue that his use of the form Shemiah in this passage points to an original form, for neither Kings nor Chronicles elsewhere uses anything but Shemaiah. Our conclusion must be that in the Chronicles account of the division we have a stage much later than that used for the Septuagint of Kings and even later than the Greek translation of the more developed text given in the B group, though a good bit earlier than the form of Kings given in our present Hebrew Bibles. That any future discussion of the relation of Kings to Chronicles must consider these facts must be clear.

Still later than this must be placed the Greek translation of the story of the sick child. It has generally been believed that it represents the translation of Aquila, and indeed the traces of that author are unmistakable.² But the story in this form is much earlier than his time, it is already in Josephus, and so must date from at least about 50 A.D. But it has been shown³ that this is only a revision of a part of our Jeroboam story "into a general but not complete accordance with Aquila's version." The importance of this proof that the story, as found in Codex A, is based on our Jeroboam account, in establishing the still earlier date of that narrative, is obvious. Still another trace of the fact that 14:1-18 is a late insertion is found in the manuscript 243 where the summary in 14:19 f. is placed, though under the asterisk, at the end of chap. 13, no doubt its original place before the story of the child in its new form was forced between them.

¹ Curtis, *ad loc.*

² It is attributed to Aquila by the Syro-Hexaplar.

³ Burkitt, *Fragments*, 33 f.

Even this Aquila text does not represent quite the latest form for the home of Jeroboam is still Zeredah and not Tirza as in the present Hebrew text, the "man of God" and the "cluster of grapes" of the original account is still in verse 3, and the "departed" of verse 17 has not yet been added. So we see the Hebrew continually growing, even to the time when the text was finally fixed.

The history of this whole section of Kings may now be summed up as follows. At some time not much later than the translation of the Law—before the time of Ptolemy IV (221–204), if we are to assume that the Demetrius who wrote a book on the kings of Judah really used a Greek translation¹—the original Jeroboam story was translated as part of a more or less complete translation of the work, other fragments of which have also survived in the B text. Not long after this, and probably as a consequence of the renewed interest in the history of the earlier kingdom excited by the rise of the Hasmoneans, it was rewritten from a Pharisaic standpoint, and it is this edition, in not far from its original form, that is given in the later account in Codex B. At this time it was that the greatest number of alterations were made and the characteristic "Deuteronomistic" coloring given. But the account had by no means ceased its growth. Some time after this edition was made, the text of Chronicles was harmonized to it, after which there was practically no change in the text of that work. A large number of additions were made after this time, say after the Christian era, and these it is that we find preserved in the later translations. The story of the child was worked over by the time of Josephus² and after this there were but minor additions to the text.

Nor are the lessons which the historian may learn from this excursion into the field of textual criticism confined to the Jeroboam narrative, valuable as they are. For it is in the hints it gives us as regards the history and development of the text and its use in historical criticism that its greatest value lies. Nowhere can we trace more in detail the various steps in the radical revision of the earlier writings which took place in the late Greek and early Roman period. And it furnishes a striking warning against trusting too much to the integrity

¹ *Frag. Hist. Graec.* III, 208.

² It is curious that Josephus regularly supports the Massoretic text in Kings, though for Chronicles he had I Esdras. No doubt the Jeroboam story had completely disappeared, while the I Esdras fragment was still known.

of the text which has come down to us. If, in this one passage where a fragment of the real Septuagint has been accidentally preserved, we find such revision, how can we be certain that equally radical revision has not taken place elsewhere where we have no such check? For this is not merely growth of the text, due to the natural errors of scribes and correctors. What we see here is revision, and revision so radical that wherever it is met, it so seriously affects not only the form but the content to such an extent that the historian must ever and always be on his guard against it. Certainly enough evidence has been collected in the preceding pages to show that a greater suspicion of the Massoretic edition, even when seemingly buttressed by the so-called "Septuagint," is amply justified.

But how may this suspicion be made intelligent when we attempt to apply it to the problem of our sources? Save for the introductory paragraph, we have in the Jeroboam story only the style and vocabulary of the prophetic writings found elsewhere in Kings, and which, at least in the Elijah-Elisha cycles, have been preserved to us virtually untouched by the "Deuteronomistic" coloring. Here, too, in the original form of the Jeroboam story, the "Deuteronomistic" coloring is likewise absent. The importance of this fact for the student of the sources can hardly be over-emphasized, for the later edition, not to speak of the still later additions, is full of the expressions attributed to the "Deuteronomistic" writer or writers. The full importance of this statement can be felt only when, in its light, one has perused the list of the most characteristic phrases or words of the "Deuteronomistic" editor of Kings as given by Driver.¹ Of the forty-eight there given, sixteen, or just one-third, are found in those sections for which, as we have seen, the original Septuagint gives no testimony. These are (2) "walk in my ways," 11:33, 38; (3) "keep my statutes and my ordinances," 11:34, 38; 14:8; (6) "that he might establish his word," 12:15; (13) "chosen out of all the tribes of Israel," 11:32; (14) "which I have chosen me to put my name there," 11:36; (16) "to cut off from upon the ground," 14:15; (20) "do that which is evil in the sight of Yahweh," 11:6; (22a) "for my servant David's sake," 11:32, 34; (22b) "David" 11:33, 38; 14:8; (23) "which I have chosen out of all the tribes of Israel," 11:32, 36; (24) "to do that

which is right in my eyes," 11:33, 38; 14:8; (25) "that David my servant may have a lamp," 11:36; (26) "to provoke me to anger," 14:9; (29) "made Israel to sin," 14:16; (45) "at that time," 14:1; (48) "forasmuch as" 14:7. If to these we add the less characteristic expressions listed by Burney,¹ we have (6) "with all his heart," 14:8; (13) "which I gave to the fathers," 14:15; (28) "all the days," 11:36, 39; (29) "other gods," 14:9; (37) "and it shall be if thou wilt hearken," 11:38; (39) "vex," 14:9, 15; (40) "from this good land," 14:15; (66) "done evil above all that were before thee," 14:9; (69) "I will utterly sweep away," 14:10; (70) "he that dwelleth," etc., 14:11. That one-third of the most characteristic expressions of the so-called "Deuteronomistic" reviser should be found as characteristic of passages whose date is certainly later than the time of the Septuagint translation cannot but lead us to wonder whether this same "Deuteronomistic" reviser is not himself of such a late date. And there is yet other evidence to prove the very late, post-Septuagintal use of these very characteristic "Deuteronomistic" phrases. It has long been a commonplace that many of these expressions are common to Jeremiah.² What has not, however, been realized is the fact that a good proportion of these common expressions can not be found in the Septuagint of Jeremiah, in other words, that they, too, date after that translation. Of the expressions characteristic of the "Deuteronomist," as listed by Driver and Burney, (D. 20) "do that which is evil in the sight of Yahweh" is found in Jer. 52:2 only under the asterisk; (D. 26) "provoke me to anger," in Jer. 25:7, is found only in Aquila and Theodotion; (D. 11) "as it is this day" is witnessed only for the "Thré" in 44:23, while not even they have it in 25:18; (D. 17) "dismiss from before thy face" is under the asterisk in Jer. 15:1; (D. 39) "my servants the prophets" is witnessed only by Theodotion in Jer. 29:19; (D. 33) "idols" is likewise witnessed only by Theodotion in Jer. 50:2; (D. 37) "burnt incense," in 11:12, is given only by Aquila and Theodotion; (B. 28) "all the days," in Jer. 33:18, is only in Theodotion; (B. 29) "other gods," in 44:15, is not found in the codices which usually have the shorter text, B and S; (B. 41) "under green hills and upon the high

¹ Art. "Kings," Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*; cf. *Text of Kings*, xviii f.

² Driver, *Introd.*, 193.

hills," in 17:2, is only in Theodotion. Driver¹ also gives a short list of expressions common to Kings and Jeremiah. Of these, "testified" is only in Theodotion in 11:7, and the same is true of "hearkened not" in the same verse. "To vex me with the works of their hands" is only in Aquila and Theodotion in 25:7, and in Aquila and Symmachus in 32:30.

All this massing of testimony can lead us to but one result. These expressions are late for the passages in which they occur are often post-Septuagintal. This does not of itself prove that they are post-Septuagintal or even post-exilic. It is possible that some of these were used in the days of the monarchy. But a very large proportion of these are undoubtedly post-Septuagintal, and every case which can be so dated reduces by just so many the cases which by any possibility can be assigned to earlier dates. But this evidence does most decidedly throw the burden of proof on any one who attempts to prove that any passage in which these expressions occur is before the time of Alexander. Such cases may be made out—but very strong evidence for an early date must be used to counterbalance the evidence for a late date furnished by the occurrence of these expressions.

But here a word of caution is necessary. We may not go so far as to say that all the passages in Kings which have been assigned to the "Deuteronomistic" editor are post-Septuagintal. Indeed, these passages fall into two sharply defined groups, the framework and the longer narratives and pious reflections. We have seen that our Jeroboam story has the usual framework introduction and even the "doing evil in the sight of Yahweh." We might think this framework a later interpolation, did we not have a similar one, even to the "doing evil in the sight of Yahweh," proved to be pre-Septuagintal by its occurrence in I Esdras, an occurrence still further proved by its being found in the Old Latin.² We must assume, then, that the framework is pre-Septuagintal. But even this has too many analogies to the longer portions to allow it to be much earlier. Further investigation is likely to prove it to belong to the Persian period and more probably to the later than to the earlier half. But this lateness of date is at least compensated by the disassociation of its data, numerous as they are, from the works of the man who rewrote the longer

¹ Driver, *Introd.*, 193.

² Codex Colbert. in Sabatier.

passages. These facts the historian can now use with much more confidence.

But this by no means proves that the passages of considerable length and written in the style which has been called "Deuteronomistic" are equally early or valuable. For a very considerable part of this so-called "Deuteronomistic" writing, we have already definitely proved that it is later than the time of the Septuagint. The natural assumption is that the remainder is from the same date. But what is more striking is that there are, with but one sure exception, II Kings 8:19, no signs of "Deuteronomistic" re-editings in a good half of the book, from I Kings, chap. 17, to II Kings, chap. 16. This of course is the group of prophetic writings whose likeness to the passages we have proved to be early we have so frequently noted. When we find that for the central half the "Deuteronomistic" re-editing is absent entirely, when we find it only appearing in isolated places here and there in the other portions, when in these portions we find that checking up by the real Septuagint, where we have it, shows it absent there too, our only conclusion is that, if we had the earliest Greek translation of this book entire, the "Deuteronomistic" passages of length would all be missing.

It is hardly necessary to point out how profoundly all this must modify our ideas as to the composition of the Book of Kings. We shall probably not much modify our general attribution of sources to the pre-exilic period. But the framework must certainly be placed much later, even if we accept its data as having less of a "tendency" than we once attributed to it when we took it in company with the longer "Deuteronomistic" passages. As for the mass of pious reflections, we can hardly do less than to make them all post-Septuagintal as the most of them certainly are.

And with this must go most of the passages used to prove the pre-exilic date of the editor of Kings. It is not without significance that the passage upon which Burney¹ most rests for the early date is that "David my servant may have a lamp always before me in Jerusalem," which we have seen was not yet in our text at the time of the Septuagint translation!² Nor can the expression "unto this day" be

¹ Art. "Kings," Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*; cf. *Text of Kings*, xvi, 107.

² The Aramaic ending קן in צדניק in vs. 33 also points to a late date for the Hebrew.

pressed to prove this theory. "Unto this day," in 12:19, is later than the Septuagint, and the same expression in 8:8 is later even than the translators used in the Hexapla. The three cases in II Kings, chap. 17, in vss. 23, 34, and 41, by their very context show that they were not written until the Samaritan schism had become acute,¹ and of course cannot possibly apply to pre-exilic times. Indeed, the section as a whole is so in the tone of our post-Septuagintal "Deuteronomistic" passages that we may attribute it to the same reviser. The other cases of "Unto this day" clearly belong to pre-exilic sources or to the author of the framework.

It is not the purpose of the present paper to discuss in detail the other passages which may be attributed to the "Deuteronomistic" reviser, much less the fragments of the real Septuagint or the more general question as to the sources of Kings. These must await a later investigation. The present paper has discussed a group of questions which are interrelated each with the other, and all of which can be illuminated by a study of the form in which the narratives were at the time when the earliest Greek translation was made. The method of the investigation has been of necessity largely textual, and it may have sometimes been forgotten that we are not interested in textual questions as such, merely as aids to the determination of the number and value of the sources which we must use in our reconstruction of the history.

From this discussion, there have emerged certain facts which may be used for later investigations. From the standpoint of historical criticism, the most important is the knowledge that the Book of Kings, as we have it now, represents not only the usual number of late additions, but is a thorough revision of post-Septuagintal date in which some passages have been thoroughly edited and many pious reflections added. There are many even later additions, but these are not homogeneous, for we can trace the gradual growth of the text and some of the phrases can be connected with post-Septuagintal phrases elsewhere. When all this has been deducted, we have the pre-Septuagintal form which must be not far from that in which the author of the framework, who must have lived in the Persian period, left it. Deducting his framework, a very easy matter, we have a

¹ Cf. Burney, *Text*, 333.

group of largely pre-exilic sources whose relationships demand further study. Chronicles has not come down to us in its earliest form, and arguments based on identity of text in the present forms of Chronicles and Kings are precarious in nature and in some cases may be shown to be inaccurate. Whatever the relation of the original work of the Chronicler to the man who made the framework of Kings, the present form of Chronicles is sometimes earlier than that given in our present Kings. All this is what on a priori grounds we should expect, for it is absurd to accept Maccabean psalms and prophecies and to still believe that the much more important history remained, as the present theory of the composition of Kings demands, practically untouched. That the Chronicler was the only man who re-wrote the history from the new point of view is extremely improbable, and in our Massoretic text we have the last form of another history, perhaps more closely based on the earlier Book of Kings, but coming from the same period and with much the same general type of thought.

It will be seen that some of the conclusions drawn differ radically from those now held as to Kings and Chronicles. But they are based on undoubted facts which seem not to have been appreciated hitherto. It is possible to minimize their importance by refusing to admit that the Septuagint, taken as a whole, and being sure that we have the real Septuagint, represents a more primitive stage of the text and that the shorter reading is, other things being equal, the better. Assuming, as the majority of us do, that these propositions are true, the remainder of our conclusions follow, it would seem, as a matter of course. But whether these conclusions are accepted or not, here are facts which the former students of the sources have but little attempted to explain. When satisfactory explanations have been found for these and similar facts connected with the study of the various Greek translations, we shall have already solved some of the most fundamental problems connected with the study of the historical criticism of our Old Testament. When we have done this, we shall no longer take the Massoretic text as a standard, but shall attempt to see what can be learned of the history of the accounts after the Septuagint translation, and then, with this knowledge, and with the edition used by the Septuagint as further basis, attack the much more complicated task of the historical criticism.



3 0112 106069625

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS-URBANA



3 0112 106069625